

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By this amendment, Claims 1 – 9 and 20 - 29 have been cancelled, without prejudice. Claims 30 - 43 have been added. Hence, Claims 30 - 43 are pending in the application.

AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION

The paragraph beginning at page 31, line 5 has been amended to correct a minor informality.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §102

Claims 1-9 and 20-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Harvey, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,583). Claims 1-9 and 20-29 have been cancelled, without prejudice. Therefore, the rejection to these claims is moot.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 30 – 43 have been added. No new matter has been added. Independent Claim 30 is allowable for at least the following reasons.

Claim 30 recites, in part:

in response to receiving user input at a first instant messaging client and a second instant messaging client, generating user messages at the first instant messaging client and the second instant messaging client, wherein the first instant messaging client has a first conversation user interface and the second instant messaging client has a second conversation user interface;
exchanging the user messages, via an instant messaging system, between the first instant messaging client and the second instant messaging client;

displaying a conversation in the first conversation user interface and the second conversation user interface, wherein said conversation is based on the user messages transferred via the instant messaging system;
in response to user input at the first instant messaging client, generating a control message at the first instant messaging client, wherein the control message is configured to control execution of an application that executes separate from the first instant messaging client;
transferring the control message, via the instant messaging system, between the first instant messaging client and the second instant messaging client; and
in response to receiving the control message, causing results of executing the application as specified by the control message to be reflected in a display provided by the second instant messaging client. (emphasis added)

Applicant notes that both the control message and the user messages are generated at the first instant messaging application. Harvey does not teach or suggest that a control message that is generated at a first instant messaging client causes results of executing an application as specified by the control message to be reflected in a display provided by the second instant messaging client; and where user messages generated in response to user input at the first instant messaging client cause a conversation to be displayed in a first conversation user interface and a second conversation user interface.

Harvey may teach a central controller module that allows clients to interact with each other. Harvey discloses the clients may interact in a variety of ways such as various applications and messaging services. Harvey teaches that a chat room application object can reside at the computer of users, as well as a central controller to allow communication between users (col.,

25, lines 39 – 48). Users can interact with each other in the chat room to indicate what game they would like to play. However, the chat application, residing at a first client, is not used to generate a control message that is used to control execution of an application that executes separate from the chat application, wherein results of executing the application as specified by the control message are caused to be reflected in a display provided by the second instant messaging client.

For example, Harvey teaches that a user may select a button in the chat room, which causes users to be set up to play a computer game against each other. However, setting up a user to play a computer game does not mean that results of executing the computer game are displayed in an instant messaging client. Harvey teaches that after the execution procedures have been completed, the users may participate in coordinated game play under the control of the central controller module. Thus, even if users participating in coordinated game play under the control of the central controller module would cause results of executing the game to be displayed on one of the computer systems, the limitations of Claim 30 are not met. At a minimum, this is because Harvey does not teach or suggest that displaying of the results of the game is due to a control message from the chat application.

For the foregoing reasons, Claim 30 is allowable. New Claim 37 contains similar limitations to those discussed with respect to Claim 30. Therefore, Claim 37 is allowable. The remaining claims depend from either Claim 30 or Claim 37, and are therefore allowable.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: March 20, 2006



Ronald M. Pomerence

Reg. No. 43,009

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110-1089
Telephone (408) 414-1080
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on 3/20/2006

by Trudy Bagdon
Trudy Bagdon